

## Kiers, Roger

---

**From:** Kiers, Roger  
**Sent:** Friday, October 01, 2010 8:55 AM  
**To:** 'Robert H Krier'  
**Cc:** Holstine, Craig; Williams, Scott; Shufelt, Sarah; 'Shufelt, Sarah CONTRACTOR@NWS'; Fuchs, Steve; Sawyer, Jeff  
**Subject:** FW: Response to Fuchs' memo of 09-21-10  
**Attachments:** McMillin Demo Pllan Step 1.pdf; PS\_Rip\_Rap\_Detail.pdf; Response to Fuchs' 09-21-10 memo.Final.doc

Mr. Krier,  
Please find Mr. Fuchs' response to your 9/24/10 letter below.

I believe that the last item in your letter was addressed in my 9/27/10 email to you. Regarding your question about the Advisory Council's opinion, we have asked the Corps when they will be seeking that opinion from the Council. To my knowledge, the Corps has not yet notified the Council.

Roger Kiers  
Cultural Resources Specialist - Archaeologist  
WSDOT Environmental Services Office  
PO Box 47332, Olympia, WA 98504-7332  
Office: 360-570-6638  
Cell: 360-485-7255  
Work schedule: M-Th 7:30-5:00, Fri 7:30-4:00 (off biweekly)

---

**From:** Fuchs, Steve  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2010 4:24 PM  
**To:** Kiers, Roger  
**Cc:** Sawyer, Jeff; Shufelt, Sarah; Williams, Scott; Holstine, Craig; Schueler, JoAnn; Reyes, Rafael; Lewis, Ron; Wilson, DeWayne  
**Subject:** RE: Response to Fuchs' memo of 09-21-10

Roger,

I believe I have identified the error in Mr. Krier's evaluation of the conceptual demolition plan. Mr. Krier is using information from the original contract plans that were based upon a different vertical datum than what we are using today. We have surveyed the existing river channel and that is what the elevation of 116 is based upon. I have corrected Mr. Krier's marked-up plan to help show the difference in the vertical datum and that sheet is attached. It is important to remind Mr. Krier that the original intent of this demolition plan was to identify a potential demolition scenario to include with the Biological Assessment so the Services could get an idea of the type of work activities that could be expected. This demolition plan is not intended to be used for construction purposes and that is why some of the dimensions are listed as plus or minus. Again, this conceptual plan was developed to help the Services understand the type of work activities that could be expected if this bridge is removed.

The Bridge Office is responsible for establishing the cost estimate for removing the McMillin Bridge. As noted in previous correspondence, the normal range is between \$25-\$40 per square foot. Due to the complexities of this bridge, they chose to use \$60 per square foot. Our biologists recommended the Aqua Dam since they have experience with this type of product and they believe it is an appropriate application for this project. Keep in mind that the contractor has to submit a demolition plan for review and approval and we do not know how they would attempt to remove the bridge. The terms and conditions contained within the Biological Opinions along with requirements from other permitting

agencies will dictate the dos and don'ts for the contractor. If these conditions required a "watchman", then we would make that part of the contract.

Regarding the existing rip rap at the south abutment, it is my understanding that there are two main reasons why the Services would like this material removed. First, the large pile of rip rap is a constriction on the floodplain which increases river velocities and thus downstream erosion. Second, the rip rap is man-made and does not allow natural processes to take place. Our Hydraulics office has analyzed the river and determined that large loose rip rap is necessary to protect the fill behind the south abutment of the new bridge. The new rip rap will be much smaller in size compared to the existing rip rap and will be installed to conform to the river bank section. The Services and Washington Fish & Wildlife are not in favor of the rip rap, but the hydraulic experts have determined that it is necessary to protect the highway.

I am not aware of any previous requests from the consulting parties for information specific to the new bridge. The new bridge is a two span bridge that spans both the main river channel but also a portion of the floodplain. Attached is a preliminary drawing that shows the new bridge in both plan and elevation views.

I only included WSDOT staff in my response to you so that you could determine when this response is ready. I am trying to be "expeditious". I assume you will address the last paragraph in Mr. Krier's letter.

Steve Fuchs  
Project Manager  
WSDOT  
T: 360-570-6664  
F: 360-570-6661

---

**From:** Kiers, Roger  
**Sent:** Monday, September 27, 2010 9:12 AM  
**To:** Fuchs, Steve; 'Manning, Sandra L NWS'  
**Cc:** Sawyer, Jeff; Shufelt, Sarah; Williams, Scott; Holstine, Craig; 'Sternner, Matthew (DAHP)'; Chris Jenkins  
**Subject:** FW: Response to Fuchs' memo of 09-21-10

Please see the attached comments/questions from Mr. Bob Krier concerning the demolition plans and Section 106 consultation.

Roger Kiers  
Cultural Resources Specialist - Archaeologist  
WSDOT Environmental Services Office  
PO Box 47332, Olympia, WA 98504-7332  
Office: 360-570-6638  
Cell: 360-485-7255  
Work schedule: M-Th 7:30-5:00, Fri 7:30-4:00 (off biweekly)

---

**From:** Robert H Krier [mailto:[neonbob@juno.com](mailto:neonbob@juno.com)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 23, 2010 9:57 PM  
**To:** Kiers, Roger  
**Subject:** Response to Fuchs' memo of 09-21-10

**Roger,**

**Please find, attached, my responses to the subject memo for your processing to the appropriate parties.**

**Thanks,  
BOB**

\*\*\* eSafe2 scanned this email for malicious content \*\*\*  
\*\*\* IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders \*\*\*